

EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF ABADY WARD & MAAZEL LLP

RICHARD D. EMERY
ANDREW G. CELLI, JR.
MATTHEW D. BRINCKERHOFF
JONATHAN S. ABADY
EARL S. WARD
ILANN M. MAAZEL
HAL R. LIEBERMAN
DANIEL J. KORNSTEIN
O. ANDREW F. WILSON
KATHERINE ROSENFELD
DEBRA L. GREENBERGER
ZOE SALZMAN
SAM SHAPIRO

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
600 FIFTH AVENUE AT ROCKEFELLER CENTER
10TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10020

TEL: (212) 763-5000
FAX: (212) 763-5001
www.ecbawm.com

DIANE L. HOUK
EMMA L. FREEMAN
DAVID BERMAN
HARVEY PRAGER
SCOUT KATOVICH
MARISSA BENAVIDES
NICK BOURLAND
ANDREW K. JONDAHL
ANANDA BURRA
MAX SELVER
VIVAKE PRASAD
NOEL R. LEÓN

June 30, 2021

By ECF

The Honorable Edward R. Korman
United States District Judge
Eastern District of New York
225 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Re: *Scott et al. v. Quay et al.*, 19-cv-01075 (ERK) (PK)

Dear Judge Korman:

This office represents the Plaintiffs and the Class in the above-captioned action. Plaintiffs write to request that the Court: (1) **unseal** Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum of Law in Further Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification (the "Reply"), previously filed under seal on May 6, 2021, and (2) grant leave to Plaintiffs to file on the public docket an unsealed and undesignated version of an exhibit to the Reply, Exhibit 1, which was also filed under seal on May 6, 2021. *See* ECF No. 132.

The reason for this request is that, pursuant to the June 24, 2021 Order of Magistrate Judge Kuo denying Defendant's motion for a protective order, Exhibit 1 to the Reply—a Bureau of Prisons After Action Report ("AAR")—is no longer designated as "Confidential" or "Attorneys' Eyes Only."

Plaintiffs originally sought the Court's permission to file the Reply and Exhibit 1 under seal because the Reply discussed the AAR and Exhibit 1 consisted of the AAR, which Defendants had designated as "Confidential" and "Attorneys' Eyes Only" under the parties' Protective Order. Plaintiffs challenged the AAR's designation. *See* ECF Nos. 126 (joint letter describing challenge), 135 (Defendant's motion pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)), 137 (Plaintiffs' reply in opposition). After reviewing the parties' written submissions and hearing argument, Judge Kuo denied Defendants' motion for a protective order and ruled that the AAR's "Confidential" and "Attorneys' Eyes Only" designations should be removed. *See* June 24, 2021 Order. On June 24, Defendant produced to Plaintiffs a copy of the AAR without the "Confidential" and "Attorneys' Eyes Only" designations, per Judge Kuo's order.

As there is no longer any rationale for the unredacted version of Plaintiffs' Reply or Exhibit 1 to remain sealed, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court unseal the Reply and grant leave to Plaintiffs to file on the public docket the undesignated version of the AAR as a replacement for Exhibit 1 to the Reply. Defendants do not object to Plaintiffs' request.

Sincerely,

/s/

Sonya Levitova

Scout Katovich

Katherine Rosenfeld

O. Andrew F. Wilson

Cc: All Counsel of Record (via ECF)